

River Road Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan

Project Team Meeting Minutes

June 17, 2009

In Attendance:

Richard Breen, City of Glenview
Kacy White, City of Glenview
Jon Henney, GSP
Felicia Harper, GSP
Aida Copic, Planning and Design Services

Dirk Gowin, Public Works
Kathy Melvin, BIC
Dave French, River Fields
Lisa Hite, Metro Parks

Distributed: Project Team meeting agenda

The meeting began with an overview of the agenda. Jon Henney noted that the June 3rd minutes have not been completed and will be distributed as soon as possible.

Meeting minutes for May 20th were approved with no corrections.

Jon Henney discussed the public meeting that was held on June 16, 2009. There was a good turn out but it seemed to be the consensus of the group that the question part conducted by Ted Grossardt was too long for the meeting.

Dave French stated that the public thought the process was confusing, people did not understand the questions being asked and the questions did not relate to the people who lived in the corridor.

Richard Breen would like to get the data or a report regarding the data. Jon Henney stated that we will receive a report from Ted Grossardt.

Richard Breen would like to decide as a team if we should use the data that we collected at the meeting. He stated we need to decide if we would like the information to go to the public because a lot of the questions were hypothetical, assuming what really is not there is there. Kathy Melvin also stated that if they are assuming that the bridge is open and functioning well that some people might not see that as true. Richard Breen would like the Project Team to discuss this issue. Kathy Melvin asked why we held the question section on the meeting. Jon H said that it is a small part of all the data we will collect to analyze.

Richard Breen wanted to know when the decision was made to hire Ted Grossardt. Dirk stated that it was his recommendation to hire Ted. He thought the feedback would be beneficial but agreed that his questions were not clear to the public. He was not able to seek approval from the whole project team for the hiring of the new consultant because it came up about 2 weeks ago and there was not enough time to take it to the project team for approval.

Jon H said that this Project Team is unique in that it is usually the client (Louisville Metro, Metro Parks and Planning and Design) and the consulting team that make up the

Project Team. Public Works does have the decision to make the call to hire an additional consultant. Ted's process provided feedback in an anonymous fashion.

Jon H stressed that it is important that the Project Team provide questions as to what they would like answered. Where do we go from here? Do we provide an additional public meeting to the schedule? How do we go about conducting the stakeholder interviews? What should the next step be in the process?

The Project Team opened these questions up for discussion. Dave French would like to see an additional meeting with input from the public. Lisa Hite realizes that every project is different and that there are many ways to conduct a meeting. She felt we need to give the public the opportunity to get issues off their chest. Aida Copic said that the survey is just a tool that we use in planning but there was no introduction to the survey and the questions regarding where people live was not clear. She felt we should look at the results as a committee but we should put some data out there to the public.

Richard Breen asked if the results of the survey would be meaningful information. Jon H stated that we have an obligation to report the findings no matter what the results show. Dirk stated that we needed to remain objective.

Aida asked where the questions came from. Jon H said that the questions were based on the original draft on-line survey that was produced and Ted took his questions from there. Richard B stated that since the questions were asked on a hypothetical fact then the data needs to be presented as that to the public. Kathy stated that we need to remember that the public does not know as much as we do about the process.

Kathy asked about Meme's email that was sent to GSP before the public meeting. Jon H stated that we received the email and he talked to Meme about the contents. He said that the original survey questions were distributed weeks ago and had received no comments or feedback from the Project Team. Jon asked the group to help identify what questions still need to be asked. He reiterated that the Project Team will get the results from Ted and can discuss them as a committee. Lisa H stated that the public will want to know the results and how it will be used.

Jon H stated that he is concerned about the on-line survey that should have been on-line on June 1st. Richard wanted to know how useful the survey will be since there will be competing interest groups taking the survey.

Lisa H reminded the group that all surveys and data that are collected will be used together. Aida said that the most important information will come from stakeholders regarding River Road. Lisa said that Meme made a point that people need to hear each other – homeowner, bicyclist, etc. She said the public need the opportunity to speak and this is different from a focus group.

Kathy stated that we will not get the buy-in from the landowner if they do not have the opportunity to speak about their concerns.

Jon H wanted to know what the best way to format the next public meeting. Kathy said we needed to have a question and answer session and Aida stated that they needed to be really simple questions. Lisa H said when they hold a meeting at Parks and they think about how to develop a relationship with people and it needs to be built overtime

and that is what we need to do here. It was decided that we need to move ahead with the Stakeholder Interview.

A discussion regarding the questions was again started by Richard. He wanted to know where the questions were about not allowing pedestrian and bikes on River Road. Jon H stated that it is state law that bikes are allowed on roads. Richard wanted to know if "Share the Road" signs were going up on River Road. He thinks that signs cannot go up until this committee decides it is ok. Dirk stated that there are no funds at this moment but River Road is a perfect candidate for a "Share the Road" sign. Richard said that there is a "Yield to Bicycles" sign on Blankenbaker and this sign is not a state approved sign and if Metro Louisville puts up a sign like this on River Road this group will be held responsible.

Jon H stated that if a "Share the Road" sign is put up on River Road it will be a recommendation from the Study and we are not there yet. Aida noted that this is a planning document and that we need to stress this to people. She added that we want them to feel good about this process.

Dirk said that any signs that are recommended will tie into the 14th points and the alternatives will be good for the bicyclist but may affect the road. Richard asked that since signage is one of the 14 points could the committee agree not to add any signage to River Road until this plan is approved. Dirk said that safety is his primary concern and that Public Works would install the signs if they felt they were necessary. Jon H suggested that this process will determine the final recommendation but Public Works has certain criteria for safety. Aida stressed that we as a project team have no authority to regulate traffic or safety and that Public Works has the right to determine what is needed.

Richard wanted to know if this plan still required approval of the 3 cities (Prospect, Indian Hills and Glenview). Dirk agreed that it does require the approval of the cities. Aida added that if one of the 3 cities does not adopt the plan than the plan will just not apply in that city.

Lisa H said that we should start with a new slate in the group and the public and go back because we did not satisfy everyone at the first meeting and that we would like to hear more from the public. Kathy believes that this will save time on the other end.

Lisa Hite heard people in the meeting that were not happy with the first public meeting and knows that we need a new meeting. The sooner we hold the next meeting the better. Dirk believes that there is an advantage of letting people vent and we need to hear from both sides since it is a resource to the whole community.

It was decided that the next public meeting will be Monday July 13, 2009 in place of the second CAG meeting. We will format questions for people to make comments about and there will be a couple of key questions. Lisa stressed that there is nothing recommended yet and that we should hear from the people first than put that into the planning process.

The topic of another location was discussed but it was decided that the second public meeting will be held at Gingerwoods on July 13th.

The project team will draft the agenda at the July 1st meeting. The public notice will be sent out as soon as possible with letters to the adjoining property owners and people who attended the first public meeting who provided email addresses will receive an email.

The next step in the process is the stakeholder interviews.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Felicia Harper

APPROVED